

### Remarks

The forgoing amendment has been made after a careful review of the present application, the references of records, and the Office Action dated April 3, 2006. In the Office Action, the examiner indicated that claims 5 and 6 would be allowed if placed in independent form and rejected claims 7 through 10 under 35 USC 112 because the language, as recited therein, indicates that both first and second paddle assemblies would be in the drum at the same time. Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC 112 and claims 2 through 4 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by Gontero.

In the forgoing amendment, the applicant has canceled claims 2 and 14, the two independent claims that the examiner rejected under Gontero. Claim 3 has been amended to incorporate all the elements of claim 5 such that amended claim 3 is claim 5 placed in independent form. The examiner has indicated that claim 5 would be allowed if placed in independent form, and therefore amended claim 3 is believed to be allowable. Claim 6 was previously dependent upon claim 5 and was indicated by the examiner as being allowable. Claim 6 has been amended to be dependent upon amended claim 3, which now incorporates all the elements of claim 5, and is therefore also allowable. Since claim 4 is dependent upon an allowable claim, it is believed that claim 4 is now allowable.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC 112 as being confusing because claim 7, upon which claims 8 through 10 were dependent, implies that both paddle assemblies are to be in the drum at the same time. This is clearly not the intent of the invention and the applicant has amended claim 7 to more clearly recite that it includes "means for

removably retaining one of said first and second paddle assembly in said drum...."

With this amendment to claim 7, the applicant traverses the rejection under 35 USC 112. As amended, claim 7 clearly indicates that only one paddle assembly is to be in the drum at a time. This is the inventive feature of claim 5 and therefore the examiner has already searched and determined that this feature is patentable and therefore it is believed that claim 7 is patentable for the same reason as previous claim 5 (now claim 3). Accordingly, the applicant submits that the rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn.

With the removal of the rejection of claim 7, claims 8 through 10, which are dependent upon claim 7 are also believed to be allowable.

Claims 11 and 12, which the examiner rejected under 35 USC 112 have been canceled.

With the forgoing amendments, the applicant believes that all of the remaining claims incorporate the elements that the examiner has found to be allowable and are therefore allowable over the references of record. Reconsideration and allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert L. Marsh  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No. 25894  
630-681-7500  
630-681-3464 (fax)

RLM:ksc

Robert L. Marsh  
P. O. Box 54  
Wheaton, Illinois 60189-4468